

II. Remarks

To highlight the distinction of the above-referenced invention over the prior art as interpreted by the Examiner in the Office Action of December 1, 2004, Paper No. 11182004, Claims 19-22 were amended to more clearly set forth Applicants' invention. In the above-referenced Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 21 and 22 on the basis of noted informalities. Claims 21 and 22 have been amended to overcome the informalities highlighted by the Examiner and also to refer back to the independent claim from which these dependent claims depend. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to amended dependent Claims 21 and 22 be withdrawn in that appropriate corrections were made to place these claims in accordance with formality requirements.

In the above-referenced Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner pointed out that Claim 19 recites elements for which there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations stated.

The undersigned respectfully requests the withdraw of this rejection with respect to amended Claim 19 for the reason that the claim as amended particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, with regard to the claim as amended be withdrawn.

In paragraph five of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the prior art drawing Figure 1. As set forth above, Claims 21 and 22 have now been amended to be proper dependent claims

from independent Claim 19. Accordingly, when read in light of the elements contained in the independent claim for which they maintain, both dependent Claims 21 and 22 should now be in condition for allowance.


In paragraph six of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 19 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. As above noted, Claim 19 has been amended to remove the informalities pointed out by the Examiner so as to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that as amended, Claim 19 is now in condition for allowance. Further, Claims 20-22 being dependent from independent Claim 19 when read in light of the limitations contained therein, should also be in condition for allowance.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections as well as rejections set forth in the subject Action be withdrawn for the reason that appropriate correction has been made to overcome each and every one of the rejections or objections. Finally, it is respectfully requested that Claims 19-22 are now in condition for allowance and formal allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter of record, Applicants' attorney may be reached at (586) 739-7445.

Respectfully submitted,

VANOPHEM & VANOPHEM, P.C.




Remy J. VanOphem
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 27053

51543 Van Dyke Avenue
Suite 103
Shelby Township, MI 48316-4447
(586) 739-7445
Attorney Docket No. LII167B US
RVO/ndt

Certificate under 37 CFR §1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 1, 2005.

Date: April 1, 2005


Remy J. VanOphem, Reg. No. 27053